

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-26 are rejected. In the above amendments, claims 1, 10, 12, 16-19, and 23 have been amended. Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

I. Claim 16 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Office Action stated that “[i]t is not clear what is being claimed, ‘a method’ or ‘a computer readable medium.’” Office Action, page 2. Claim 16 has been amended to delete the word “method.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

II. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 12, 14, 16-19, 21, 23 and 25 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 12, 14, 16-19, 21, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,230,012 to Willkie et al. (hereinafter, “Willkie”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP § 2131 (citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” Id. (citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). In addition, “the reference must be enabling and describe the applicant’s claimed invention sufficiently to have placed it in possession of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention.” In re Paulsen, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 1 recites “detecting a trigger indicating whether a remote station associated with an existing network server is associated with a new base station.” Claim 1 has been amended to recite that “the trigger is detected after PPP option negotiation has been completed on both an R_m interface and a U_m interface.” Claim 1 has also been amended so that it now recites “re-synchronizing the PPP link on the U_m interface if the remote station is associated with the new

network server.” Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that “the PPP link on the U_m interface is re-synchronized without re-synchronizing the PPP link on the R_m interface or affecting the PPP link on the R_m interface.” These amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [1044]-[1046] of Applicants’ specification and Figures 3-4 of Applicants’ drawings.

Applicants refer to the following portion of Willkie, which states:

In the start resync of PPP state 704, the MT2 device 104 shuts down the PPP_R protocol 605, and forwards the original LCP packet (cached earlier in the monitoring PPP_R state 702) to the IWF 108, thereby initiating a PPP link directly between the TE2 device 102 and the IWF 108. This is done to avoid the overhead of running the PPP_R protocol 605 and PPP_U protocol 615 on the MT2 device 104 for a simple IP call. . . .

If, however, the TE2 device’s IPCP configure request contains a static IP address, then the MT2 device 104 transitions to the negotiate PPP_U state 706 after the PPP_R link has been fully negotiated in the monitoring PPP_R state 702. Once in the negotiate PPP_U state 706, the MT2 device 104 initiates the additional layers in the MT2 protocol stack including mobile IP protocol 609, UDP protocol 611, IP protocol 613, and PPP_U protocol 615. The MT2 device 104 also flow controls the TE2 device 102. Again, flow control refers to preventing the TE2 device 102 from sending or receiving any data over the R_M interface.

Willkie, col. 13, lines 7-25 (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5-7, and 9 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3, 5-7, and 9 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those provided above in relation to claim 1.

Claim 8 has been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claim 12 recites “detecting a condition that indicates whether PPP re-synchronization is required.” Claim 12 has been amended to recite that “the condition is detected after PPP option negotiation has been completed on both an R_m interface and a U_m interface.” Claim 12 has also been amended so that it now recites “re-synchronizing the PPP link on the U_m interface if it is determined that PPP re-synchronization is required.” Claim 12 is also being amended to recite that “the PPP link on the U_m interface is re-synchronized without re-synchronizing the PPP link

on the R_m interface or affecting the PPP link on the R_m interface.” These amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [1044]-[1046] of Applicants’ specification and Figures 3-4 of Applicants’ drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 12 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 14 depends from claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those provided above in relation to claim 12.

Claim 16 recites “detecting a trigger indicating whether a remote station associated with an existing network server is associated with a new base station.” Claim 16 has been amended to recite that “the trigger is detected after PPP option negotiation has been completed on both an R_m interface and a U_m interface.” Claim 16 has also been amended so that it now recites “re-synchronizing the PPP link on the U_m interface if the remote station is associated with the new network server.” Claim 16 has also been amended to recite that “the PPP link on the U_m interface is re-synchronized without re-synchronizing the PPP link on the R_m interface or affecting the PPP link on the R_m interface.” These amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [1044]-[1046] of Applicants’ specification and Figures 3-4 of Applicants’ drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 16 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

Claim 17 recites “means for detecting a trigger indicating whether the remote station associated with an existing network server is associated with a new base station.” Claim 17 has been amended to recite that “the trigger is detected after PPP option negotiation has been completed on both an R_m interface and a U_m interface.” Claim 17 has also been amended so that it now recites “means for re-synchronizing a PPP link on the U_m interface if the remote station is associated with the new network server.” Claim 17 has also been amended to recite that “the PPP link on the U_m interface is re-synchronized without re-synchronizing the PPP link on the R_m interface or affecting the PPP link on the R_m interface.” These amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [1044]-[1046] of Applicants’ specification and Figures 3-4 of Applicants’ drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 17 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 recites “means for detecting whether a new remote station associated with an existing network server is associated with the base station.” Claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the trigger is detected after PPP option negotiation has been completed on both an R_m interface and a U_m interface.” Claim 18 has also been amended so that it now recites “means for re-synchronizing a PPP link on the U_m interface if the base station is associated with the new network server.” Claim 18 has also been amended to recite that “the PPP link on the U_m interface is re-synchronized without re-synchronizing the PPP link on the R_m interface or affecting the PPP link on the R_m interface.” These amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [1044]-[1046] of Applicants’ specification and Figures 3-4 of Applicants’ drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 18 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 recites “a processor configured to detect a trigger indicating whether a new remote station is associated with the base station associated with an existing network server.” Claim 19 has been amended to recite that “the trigger is detected after PPP option negotiation has been completed on both an R_m interface and a U_m interface.” Claim 19 has also been amended to recite that “the processor is also configured to re-synchronize the PPP link on the U_m interface if the base station is associated with the new network server, and wherein the PPP link on the U_m interface is re-synchronized without re-synchronizing the PPP link on the R_m interface or affecting the PPP link on the R_m interface.” These amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [1044]-[1046] of Applicants’ specification and Figures 3-4 of Applicants’ drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 19 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claim 21 depends from claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those provided above in relation to claim 19.

Claim 23 recites “a processor configured to detect a trigger indicating whether the remote station associated with an existing network server is associated with a new base station.” Claim 23 has been amended to recite that “the trigger is detected after PPP option negotiation has been

completed on both an R_m interface and a U_m interface.” Claim 23 has also been amended to recite that “the processor is also configured to re-synchronize the PPP link on the U_m interface if the new base station is associated with the new network server, and wherein the PPP link on the U_m interface is re-synchronized without re-synchronizing the PPP link on the R_m interface or affecting the PPP link on the R_m interface.” These amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [1044]-[1046] of Applicants’ specification and Figures 3-4 of Applicants’ drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 23 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

Claim 25 depends from claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those provided above in relation to claim 23.

III. Claims 2, 13, 20 and 24 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 13, 20 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,721,555 to Phillips et al. (hereinafter, “Phillips”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,920,545 to Rasanen (hereinafter, “Rasanen”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants refer to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), which states:

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Applicants respectfully submit that Phillips may qualify as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Phillips and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, both owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to QUALCOMM, Inc. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 13, 20 and 24 be withdrawn.

IV. Claims 4, 11, 15, 22 and 26 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4, 11, 15, 22 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Willkie in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,270 to Kumar (hereinafter, “Kumar”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 4 and 11 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4 and 11 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as provided above in relation to claim 1.

Claim 15 depends from claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as provided above in relation to claim 12.

Claim 22 depends from claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 22 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as provided above in relation to claim 19.

Claim 26 depends from claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as provided above in relation to claim 23.

V. Claim 10 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Willkie in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,536 to Basiller (hereinafter, “Basiller”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as provided above in relation to claim 1.

VI. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 7, 2007

By: /Kam T. Tam/
Kam T. Tam, Reg. No. 35,756
(858) 651-5563

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502